

further proceedings is proper in a case that requires additional fact finding. See Meyer v. Astrue, 662 F.3d 700, 707 (4th Cir. 2011) (“Assessing the probative value of competing evidence is quintessentially the role of the fact finder. We cannot undertake it in the first instance. Therefore, we must remand the case for further fact finding”).

Here, the Commissioner asserts that “further fact-finding and analysis is required” and represents that Plaintiff’s counsel consents to the relief requested. Doc. 24 at 1.

Accordingly, the undersigned will grant the Commissioner’s Motion to Remand. The undersigned does not, though, forecast a decision on the merits of Plaintiff’s application for disability benefits. See Patterson v. Commissioner of Social Security Admin., 846 F.3d 656, 663 (4th Cir. 2017). “Under § 405(g), ‘each final decision of the Secretary [is] reviewable by a separate piece of litigation,’ and a sentence-four remand order ‘terminate[s] the civil action’ seeking judicial review of the Secretary’s final decision.” Shalala v. Schaefer, 509 U.S. at 299 (quoting Sullivan v. Finkelstein, 496 U.S. 617, 629, 110 S.Ct. 2658, 2666, 110 L.Ed.2d 563 (1990)).

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED THAT:

1. The Motion for Reversal and Remand Pursuant to Sentence Four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) (Doc. 24) is **GRANTED**, the Commissioner's decision is **REVERSED**, and this matter is **REMANDED** for a new hearing pursuant to sentence four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g); and
2. Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment (Doc. 21) is **DENIED AS MOOT**.

Signed: January 6, 2022



W. Carleton Metcalf
United States Magistrate Judge

